

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 5-18 are currently pending in the present application. In this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 14, and 18 to clarify what the Applicant regards as the invention. In addition, the Applicant has provided remarks that explain some of the differences between the present invention and the references cited by the Examiner. In light of these differences, the Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

At pages 4- of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,944,773 (“Abrahams”). For at least the reasons set forth below, the Applicant submits that the Examiner’s rejections have been overcome.

Abrahams discloses a method of online authentication that includes having a user present one or more fingerprints for authentication during an online transaction. *See* Abstract. As one feature, Abrahams allows a time-out loop to be used. *See* Col. 6, lines 4-5. The time-out loop would require that the user enter the requested fingerprint within a predetermined amount of time. *Id.* at Col. 6, lines 5-7. If the time-out loop expires before the user enters the requested fingerprint, the user would not be authenticated. *Id.* at Col. 6, lines 7-9.

Claims 1, 7, 14, and 18 of the present invention recites the features “receiving information identifying a user being authenticated,” “comparing each data set of biometric contact characteristics with authentic versions stored in a database to determine whether each data set of biometric contact characteristics belongs to the user whose identity information was received,” and “determining whether the data sets are obtained within a predetermined period of time of one another when it is determined that each data set of biometric contact characteristics belongs to the user for which identifying information was provided.” On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the indentifying information can be fingerprints. However, claims 1, 7, 14, and 18 each requires “receiving information identifying a user being authenticated” and “obtaining from a biometric contact sensor a data set of biometric contact characteristics for each of a plurality of body parts.” Abrahams does not teach or suggest both of these claimed features. The fingerprints obtained in Abrahams can only correspond to one of these claimed features. Moreover, Abrahams fails to teach that biometric data is compared to biometric data in a database for the user whose identity information was received. Abrahams fails to disclose how it determines which fingerprints in

the database the received fingerprints are to be compared. Because Abrahams fails to teach each and every feature of the present invention recited by claims 1, 7, 14, and 18, as amended, Applicant submits that the Examiner's § 102 rejection has been overcome.

Claims 2, 6, and 11, which depend from claims 1 and 7 respectfully, are also not taught for the reasons discussed in connection with claims 1 and 7.

THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 8, 9, and 17 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Abrahams in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,139 to Lin *et al.* ("Lin"). Claim 10 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Abrahams in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,296 to Upton ("Upton"). Finally, claim 12 was rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over Abrahams in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,806 to Colbert ("Colbert").

As set forth above, however, Abrahams fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the present invention recited by the claims. Lin fails to cure the deficiencies of Abrahams. Upton and Colbert similarly fail to cure the deficiencies of Abrahams. As such, Applicant submits that the Examiner's § 103 rejections have also been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorneys to discuss any issues pertaining to the patentability of the pending claims. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith extending the period for response two months to and including October 27, 2011. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. Should any other fees be required, however, please charge such fee to Murphy & King, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-4545, Order No. 5231-094-US01.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2011

/Chadwick A. Jackson, Reg. No. 46,495/

Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495
Murphy & King, P.C.
1055 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20007
(202) 403-2102 Tel.
(202) 429-4380 Fax